

UNITED & ES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION N	NUMBER FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPU	ICANT ATTY, DOCKET NO.
09/5	40,342 10,0	ácht call sin	2 ARCP: 194
			EXAMINER
0.00	Y at the state of the state of	16N2/070S	
	J SERTICH .D WHITE AND)	DURKEE	ART UNIT PAPER NUMB
P 0 B	80% 4433		11
PROFILE (ON TX 77210		1818 / 1
			DATE MAILED: 07/38/97
This is a commu COMMISSIONE	inication from the examine R OF PATENTS AND TRA	or in charge of your application. ADEMARKS	e constant
		OFFICE ACTION SUM	MARY
Responsive to	communication(s) filed	on 2/25/97 + 4/	14/97
☐ This action is F	INAL.	·	
Since this appli	ication is in condition to	or allowance except for formal matter	prosecution as to the merits is closed in
accordance wit	th the practice under Ex	x parte Quayle, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G.	prosecution as to the merits is closed in 213.
A shortened statuto	ry period for response	to this action is set to expire	month(s), or thirty days,
whichever is longer,	, from the mailing date o	of this communication. Failure to recog	and within the named for second 10
1.136(a).	scome abandoned. (35	U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time ma	by be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR
Disposition of Clai	lms		
Claim(s)	1.400	10 10 10 000 - 22 0	
Of the above, c	laim(s)	, 10-15, 18-28, +33-5	is/are pending in the application
Claim(s)			is/are withdrawn from consideration is/are allowed.
Claim(s)	1,4,5,8	, 10-15, 18-28 9 33-	-50 is/are rejected.
			is/are objected to.
Claim(s)			are subject to restriction or election requirement
Application Papers	3		
See the attache	d Notice of Draftsperso	on's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.	
The drawing(s)	filed on	is/are	e objected to by the Examiner
i ne proposea a	rawing correction, filed	on	is _ approved _ disapproved.
The specification	n is objected to by the f	Examiner.	
The bath of dec	laration is objected to b	by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.	.S.C. § 119		
Acknowledgmer	nt is made of a claim for	r foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119((a)-(d).
_	- Living Or the	CERTIFIED copies of the priority docu	ments have been
received.			
received in	Application No. (Series	Code/Serial Number)	·
		ication from the International Bureau (F	CT Rule 17.2(a)).
*Certified copies n			
_		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Acknowledgmen		domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(e).
		domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(e).
attachment(s)		domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(e).
Attachment(s) Notice of Referen	t is made of a claim for		9(e).
Notice of Referer	t is made of a claim for nce Cited, PTO-892 osure Statement(s), PT	domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11:	9(e).
Notice of Referer Information Discl	t is made of a claim for nce Cited, PTO-892 osure Statement(s), PT ary, PTO-413	O-1449, Paper No(s) / 0	9(e).
Notice of Referent Information Disclusion Interview Summa	t is made of a claim for nce Cited, PTO-892 osure Statement(s), PT	O-1449, Paper No(s). / b	9(e).

Commence with the contraction of the contraction of

The Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 1819.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 16, and 17 are cancelled, claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10-15, and 18-27 are amended, and new claim 33 has been added, as requested in the amendment filed 2/25/97. New claims 34-50 have been added as requested in the supplemental amendment filed 4/14/97. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10-15, 18-28 and 33-50 are now in the application.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10-12, 28, 34-39 are newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Newly amended claims 1 and 34 recite a method for potentiating "the response" of a tumor cell, but do not identify the nature of "the response" which is potentiated, so that it is unclear what are the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Claim 28 is indefinite because it recites aprocess employing an adenovirus, but it depends on claim 24, which states that the virus in HSV.

The specification remains objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to use the claimed invention, for the reasons discussed below and in the last office action.

Newly amended claims 1 and 34 recite a method for potentiating "the response" of a tumor cell, which encompasses any response; however, the only response disclosed by the specification which is potentiated by injection of HSV-1 into mouse having a tumor formed from implanted glioblastoma cells (Example 1), or by injection of an adenovirus into a tumor formed

from colon carcinoma cell implanted in a mouse which is subsequently treated by radiation therapy (Example 2), is inhibition of tumor growth. One skilled in the art at the time the application was filed would have recognized that the art of reliably eliciting a given response from any type of tumor cell is highly unpredictable as discussed in the previous office action. Said skilled artisan would have recognized that the response of any tumor cell to any anti-tumor agent depends critically and unpredictably on the chemical structure of the anti-tumor agent and on the type of tumor cell. When the antitumor agent is a nucleic acid vector and the tumor cells are growing in vivo, so that the method is a form of gene therapy, the successful operation of the method is also recognized to depend unpredictably on the means by which the nucleic acid vector is administered to the subject, also as discussed in the previous office action. The specification is deficient in its teachings regarding the method wherein injection of HSV-1 into a mouse with a tumor formed from implanted glioblastoma cells, because nowhere in the disclosed example does the specification teach the site or mode of injection, i.e. intravenous, intraperitoneal, subcutaneous, etc., so that it is unclear to one skilled in the art how to effectively administer the HSV-1 to obtain the disclosed results.

Claims 1, 8, 10-13, 18-23, and 25-27 recite any herpesvirus, and claims 4, 14, and 24, recite any herpes simplex virus (HSV). One skilled in the art would recognize that there are many diverse types of herpesvirus, such as Epstein-Barr virus and cytomegalovirus, and that the structures and activities of herpesviruses within the HSV family also show clear and distinct differences. Said skilled artisan would reasonably have considered that, in the absence of data regarding the specific features of herpesviruses in general, and of HSV viruses in particular, which mediate the inhibition of gliomablastoma tumor

cell proliferation, it is unpredictable and uncertain whether any virus other than HSV-1 will have the anti-glioblastoma tumor activity of HSV-1 as disclosed in Example 1. Similarly, claims 28 and 34-50 recite any type of adenovirus, yet one skilled in the art would recognize that the different types of adenoviruses also differ concretely in their structures and activities, and one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed would reasonably have considered that it is unpredictable and uncertain whether any virus other than HSV-1 will have the anti-colon carcinoma tumor activity of adenovirus type 5 as disclosed in Example 2.

Given the breadth of the claims, which encompass potentiation of an unspecified type of response in a wide variety of different type of tumor cells by a wide variety of different types of herpesviruses and adenoviruses, given the unpredictability of the successful operation of the claimed invention, and given the lack of guidance in the specification or in the prior art regarding how to use the claimed invention successfully in all but one of its narrowest embodiment wherein the method comprises the steps of direct injection of a type 5 adenovirus into a colon carcinoma tumor, followed by X-irradiation, undue experimentation would have been required by one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed to practice the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10-15, 18-28 and 33-50 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification, as stated in the last office action for claims .

The rejection of claims 1, 8, 12, 23-25, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Fujiwara et al. has been withdrawn in view of the amendments filed 2/25/97 and 4/14/97.

The rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10-15, 18-2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Wills et al. taken with additional

references has been withdrawn in view of the amendments filed 2/25/97 and 4/14/97.

The claims are allowable over the prior art because at the time the application was filed the prior art did not teach or suggest the claimed methods in a manner such that one of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably expected to be able to make or use the claimed invention successfully.

No claims are allowed.

Applicant's arguments filed 2/25/97 and 4/14/97 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Applicants urge that objection to the specification and rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failure to adequately teach how to use the invention, be reconsidered and withdrawn, because the disclosed examples adequately teach one skilled in the art how to use the claimed methods wherein herpesviruses or adenoviruses are administered as anti-cancer agents to inhibit tumor growth.

The examiner maintains that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, in the first office action was based on reference to relevant teachings in the published literature, and on consideration of the nature of the invention, the quantity of experimentation required, the amount of guidance presented in the specification, the presence and absence of working examples, the state of the prior art, the degree of predictability of successful operation of the claimed invention, and the breadth of the claims, as called for in In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The objections to the specification and rejection of claims have been partially withdrawn in response to Applicants' amendments; however, the claims still encompass non-enabled methods wherein any type of

herpesvirus or adenovirus is administered by any means to any of a wide variety of tumors. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires that the scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art. Fisher, 166 USPQ at 21-22, 24 (CCPA 1970). The disclosed examples only support narrow embodiments of the claimed invention, as discussed above. Accordingly, rejection of the broadly claimed methods under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is proper.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

General Information Regarding Further Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Charles Rories, Group 1800, Art Unit 1819, at telephone number (703)-308-1120. The examiner can normally be reached from 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jasemine Chambers, can be reached at (703)-308-2035.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Art Unit 1819 in Crystal Mall I by facsimile transmission to telephone number (703)-308-0294. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG (November 15, 1989).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application, should be directed to the Group 1800 receptionist, at telephone number (703)-308-0196.

7 July 1997

Charles C. P. Rorie

Patent Examiner Art Unit 1819